

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/281,674	03/30/1999		HERMANN BUJARD	BBI-013C3CN2CPA	7512
959	7590	10/28/2003		EXAMINER	
_	COCKFIEL	D	SHUKLA, RAM R		
28 STATE S				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02109				1632	

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/281,674	BUJARD ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ram R. Shukla	1632
Th MAILING DATE of this communicati n appe	ars on the cover she t with th	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 17 September 2000 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application in the second	cation. A proper reply to a chiplaces the application in
	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE con which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>17 September 2003</u> 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	•
(a) they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTE below):
		See NOTE below),
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note because of the second to place the application is		arially raducing or simplifying the
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appear by mat	enally reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: None.		
Claim(s) objected to: None.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6.9-14 and 17-19</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	 .
10. Other:	PRIMARY EXAMINER	Ram R. Shukla, Ph.D. Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1632

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants have maintained their arguments that the claimed invention is enballed for the full scope. Applicants have reiterated their arguments from previous dates 2-27-02 and 2-21-03 and have argued that post filing arts show that the in vivo method comprising any route of administration and two nucleic acids not covalently linked for delivery of the genes are enabled and that the examiner has not provided any evidence as to how the successful in vivo studies can be termed direct. In response, applicants are advised to look at their response of 2-27-02 which summarized that the methods were direct administration. For example, Dhawan et al, Fishman et al were both indicated as methods of direct injection in muscles. Regarding the Regulier et al article, again the injection was direct into the striatum. Applicants have not provided any evidence to support their argument that the administration in these post filing arts was by any other route than direct. Accordingly, all the rejections are maintained for reasons of record set forth in the previous office actions of 5-23-00, 8-28-01, 10-21-02 and 5-16-03.

HAM P. SHUKLA, PH.D